

John, the same John who wrote the Gospel some sixty years afterwards. Whatever Jesus had appointed these two to do, we are told they did. What then was their commission? "Go and prepare us the passover, that we may eat." Luke 22:8. "Go into the city to such a man and say unto him, The Master says my time is at hand. I will keep the passover at thy house with my disciples." The special point I now make just here is that these two did say to the good man of the house as they were told, and hence John did call the meal passover in A. D. 33, and I positively object to all anti-Bible prefixes to this passover. There was no *Jewish* passover, *Christian* passover, Mohammedan passover, Pagan passover nor any other, but the one, the Lord's passover, and wherever and whenever the word passover was used up to the time of Christ's crucifixion, this, and only this passover was meant. This passover was established by the Lord in Egypt and was kept by the Jews, up to this last night by Christ and the Apostles. There never was any other. It seems however, to have been modified from time to time, as circumstances required. For instance, the directions to eat the passover in the posture and with the equipments of travelers, seems to have been observed only on the first passover. Nor do we find any use of the blood any more on the door posts, while there is plenty of evidence that the feast was seldom if ever kept according to the original directions. All this, however, amounts to but little when we consider the fact that Christ was the author of all divine law, and that in his last days on earth especially the "Father had given all things into his hands," it was his prerogative to keep the passover, or not keep it, keep it strictly after the original ritual, or with all the modifications that seemed good to him. The fact through all phases of the case remains that he did keep it and that John called it the passover, when he with Peter arranged for it in accordance with the directions of the Master, and farther that there was but one feast kept that night, there was time for but one, and this had as we have seen the dual design of ending the passover and inaugurating the supper, and hence Luke calls it by both names, a thing unheard of before. Now John, who went with Peter and said to the master of the house, "The Master says, My time is at hand, I will keep the passover at thy house with my disciples." This same John writes his Gospel 60 years afterwards and invariably calls this same meal supper. All these are plain facts, and with all the assertions, denials and everything that can be said and done, the fact remains that John calls this meal

passover in A. D. 33—and supper in A. D. 93. Now if anyone can explain this on any other line of reasoning than the duality line we have presented, I ask him in all candor to do it. Do not depend upon mere assertions, we will not accept them, and above all, forbear the attempt of trying to belittle my position as some, and especially one brother, who has a gift in that direction, tried to do before. Give us good, sound, theological reasoning, and above all, bear in mind that it is a love for the truth that we should be governed by.

Congress, Ohio, Jan. 12, 1896.

### TRINE SPRINKLING SINGLE IMMERSION, TRINE IMMERSION.

Matt. 28:19.

I. D. BOWMAN.

Those who sprinkle or pour usually follow the rules of language that apply to the construction of the baptismal formula. For the sake of brevity and simplicity I give commonly accepted rules of language in my own words.

*Rule.*—When two or more names are modified by "the" and connected by "and" they indicate separate things or persons and can not be united as one. Example: *I saw the preacher AND THE teacher AND THE musician—three persons.*

*Rule.*—When "the" and "and" are not repeated they denote one person or thing. Example: *I saw the preacher, teacher, and musician—one person.*

*Applied.*—Baptizing them in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost. According to these established rules the baptismal formula requires baptism in the name of the Father, separate and distinct from the Son and Holy Ghost, and in the name of the Son, separate from the Father and Holy Ghost etc. Hence three actions are required.

*Rule.*—When possessive nouns are used in the objective form and "of" introduces each phrase, they denote separate ideas, persons or things. Example: *The book of John and of James—two books.*

*Rule.*—When "of" is not repeated they denote but one. Example: *The book of John and James—one book.*

Baptizing them in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost. The repetition of the preposition "of" requires three actions.

If we would take the liberty to cut out "and of the" before "Son" and "Holy Ghost" it still could not teach one act for the sentence would be incorrect. Example: *Their name is John, James, and William.—Incorrect.*

Their names are John, James, and William.—Correct.

Name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost would be an incorrect phrase; but names of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost—a correct phrase. Whence if we would throw away "and of the" before Son and Holy Ghost which no man not even an angel from heaven is allowed to do, we would have to further alter the word by changing "name" to "names" before the formula would admit of one act: or we could leave name in the singular, if we would add to the end of the sentence: as, Name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, which is Lord—meaning that *Lord* is one of the names of Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. Hence we must add to and take from before it would permit of one action.

Therefore all these rules show that Catholics, Lutherans, Episcopalians, Greeks, and many others are right by adhering to and insisting upon three actions in baptism. Indeed there has never been a sentence produced in any language with the same construction, or parts of speech as Matt. 28:19, that teaches one action. Rules of language have many exceptions, but there are not enough in the Greek or English language to make Matt. 28:19, teach one action.

When an active transitive participle or verb followed by an object, as "baptizing them," modified by phrases with the same parts of speech as the commission, always requires three actions; there *never* has been an exception produced. Scores could be produced that clearly teach three actions. I will give but one example. Go ye therefore and bring the Gospel, writing your name in the book of Matthew, and of Mark, and of Luke. This requires the writing of your name three times—once in each book.

Single immersionists follow strictly rules of language in ascertaining the meaning of the word baptize. All Greek and English dictionaries give immerse, dip, plunge, or some similar meaning as the *only* primary meaning of baptize.

*Rule.*—We must *always* use the primary meaning of words unless impossible.

If the word baptize had a number of meanings we have no right to give it any other than the primary meaning when applied to water baptism.

*Illustration.*—A contracts with B to drive A's sheep down into the river and wash them by dipping them into the stream for which A is to pay B fifty dollars.

B drives the sheep down to the river and takes a sprinkler and makes them wet then demands the fifty dollars. A says B did not fulfil his part of the contract. B says he did. B sues A.